UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/727,709	12/04/2000	Stacy Bryant	52493.000126	3945

7590   08/15/2003

Hunton & Williams
1900 K Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20006-1109

EXAMINER
THAI, HANH B

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2171	

DATE MAILED: 08/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *The Amendment filed 7/7/03* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-24* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .   6) ☐ Other: .

This is in response to the Amendment filed July 7, 2003.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-5, 7, 20, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602.

1.   Regarding claims 1-3 and 22, Northington discloses a process for performing

administrative functions connected with a sales related database comprising the steps of:

-          receiving updated information (see column 9, lines 42-48) for the sales-related

database in a file configured in a predetermined format, the updated information

comprising at least one of sales made by sales agents, brokers, distributors r

dealers, commissions owed to sales agents, brokers, distributors of dealers,

status of sales agents, brokers, distributors of dealers, and licensure status of

sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers, and being provided by a user

interacting with an administrative tool having at least one broker operations

module for updating broker information in the sales related database, and at least

one of a login module (see col. 6, lines 52-60), a report builder module, a

database access module, and a file upload module (see col. 7, lines 51-53,

Northington);

- saving the configured file containing the updated information to the sales related

database (column 9, lines 49-58, Northington); and

- uploading the sales-related database to a web-based database using the

administrative tool. Northington teaches using "known in the art" programs to

accomplish uploading of data (see column 7, lines 45-53).

Northington does not explicitly disclose the "rate change module". But, Northington

discloses "credit rating" (see column 15, line 49, northington) and "financial

transaction...debit..credit" (see col. 16, lines 7-16, Northignton). Therefore, it would

have been obvious to include a "rate change module" for the credit rate changes

associated with product. Hence, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled

in the art at the time of the invention to use the rate change module and associate it with

the rating process in Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to create

and debug software efficiently. Specially, it was well known that coding in modules

allows for parallel debugging, resulting better and less time.

2.   Regarding claim 4, Northington disclose a system for performing functions relating to

administration of sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers connected with a sales-related

database comprising:

        a user-interactive administrative tool for providing updated information to a sales-related

        database, the administrative tool having at least one broker operations module for

updating broker information in the sales related database, a rate change module, and at

least one of:

- "a user login module" for restricting access to the system (see col. 6, lines 52-60

    and col. 10, line 66 to col. 11, line3, Northington);

- "a database access" for accessing data stored in the sales-related database and

    for reading one or more configured files (see col. 8, lines 9-13); and

- "a file upload" for uploading data to the sales-related database and the system

    (see column 7, lines 45-53).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose "access module" and "upload

module". But, Northington teaches using "known in the art" programs to accomplish

uploading of data (see column 7, lines 45-53) and "levels of access" (see col. 2, lines 44-

53, Northington). The exminer takes official notice that program modules for such a

purpose were well known, and in fact contemplated by Northington's express suggestion.

Hence, it would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of

the invention to use the well-known upload module and associate it with the upload

process in Northington. The motivation of doing so would have been to create and debug

software efficiently. Specially, it was well known that coding in modules allows for

parallel debugging, resulting better and less time.

3.   Regarding claim 5, Northington further discloses the system comprising a report building

module for presenting data in one or more predetermined formats, for generating one or more

reports (see col. 8, lines 1-9), and for tracking access (see col. 8, lines 9-13) and navigation

through the sales databases (see col. 8, lines 41-55, Nothington).

4.   Regarding claim 7, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed

above, except Northington does not disclose "HTTP servlet module". Northington, however,

discloses the Web interface using browser software (see col. 8, lines 7-18) and the "HTTP sevlet

module" must be included in that Web interface.

5.   Regarding claims 20 and 24, Northington discloses a process for updating information

relating to administration of sales agent, brokers, distributorsor dealers in a sales-related database

comprising the steps of:

-        receiving an access request (see col. 6, lines 52-60 and col. 10, line 66 to col. 11,

         line3, Northington);

-        determining if the access request is valid (see col.), line 59 to col. 7, line4);

-        receiving updated information if the access request is valid, the updated

         information being provided by a user interacting with an administrative tool

         having at least one broker operations module for updating broker information in

         the sales related database, a rate change module, and at least one of a login

         module, a report builder module, a broker operations module, a database access

         module, and file upload module (see column 9, lines 42-48);

-        verifying the received updated information (col.), lines 49-59, Northington).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose "replicating the sales-related database". But, Northington discloses the data's uploads and downloads processing (see col. 7, lines 51-53, Northington). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to replicate database by downloading data. The examiner notes, by definition, as soon as the data is downloaded and or uploaded, and the process is completed the data has been replicated. The motivation of doing so would have been to transmit data to the users.

Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Harris et al. (U. S. Patent no. 5,893,904).

6.   Regarding claim 6, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed above, except Northington does not disclose "broker module". Harris, however, discloses the sell module in which the sale is to be brokered (see column 17, lines 49-63 and 18, lines50-54). Therefore, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify the teaching of Northington to include the broker module as taught by Harris. The motivation of doing so would have been for the entity in Northington's system to have the broker to find and identify the recipient of a transaction, sale or purchasing.

Claim 8 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of Kappel (U. S. Patent no. 6,144,988).

7.   Regarding claim 8, Northington discloses all of the claimed subject matter as discussed

above, except Northington does not disclose "plurality of servlets". Kappel, however, discloses

multiple servlets (Processing Servlet and Offer Servlet, Fig. 4, Kappel). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the invention to modify Northington as

taught by Kappel to describe the communication over the web server (column 1, lines 44-46,

Kappel).

        Claims 9, 19 and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of O'Neil et al. (U. S. Patent no.

5,987,440).

8.   Regarding claims 9, 19 and 23, Northington discloses a process for performing functions

relating to administration of sales agents, brokers, distributors or dealers connected with a sales-

related database comprising the steps of:

-       receiving login information from a client system (see col. 6, lines 52-56,

        Northington);

-       determining if the login information is valid (see col. 6, lines 56-60);

-       transmitting an administrative functions home page to the client system if the

        login information is valid, the administrative functions home page being

        associated with an administrative tool having at least one of a login module, a

        report builder module, a broker operations module, a database access module,

        and a file upload module (column 6, line 56 to col. 7, line 4, Northington);

- receiving updated information in a predetermined format, the updated

 information being provided by a user interacting with the administrative tool

 (see col. 9, lines 42-48)

- updating the sales-related database to store the received updated information

 (see col. 9, lines 49-58, Northington).

Northington, however, does not explicitly disclose receiving a function link selection

from the client system, determining which function link was selected and displaying an

administrative function screen corresponding to the function link selected. O'Neil, on the other

hand, discloses the web links (see column 5, lines 51-61, O'Neil), the selected link and

displaying function screen by the "E-Metro Community administrator" on the "Netscape

Navigator". Therefore, the Community administrator handles the administrative function as

claimed. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the

invention to modify Northington to include the function links as taught by O'Neil. The

motivation of doing so would have been to process and display the requested information by the

users over the Internet.

Claims 10-12 and 13-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over

Northington et al. (U. S. Patent no. 6,128,602) in view of O'Neil et al. (U. S. Patent no.

5,987,440) and further view of Raveis (U. S. Parent no. 6,321,202).

9.   Regarding claims 10-11, Northington/ O'Neil combination discloses all of the claimed

subject matter as discussed above, except "field for entering information in broker information

screen". Raveis, however, discloses the detail broker information (see column 5, lines 8-20 and

Fig. 5, Raveis), displaying the broker information screen ("Microsoft Visual FoxPro", Fig. 4-5)

and updated information entered in at least one field (field 351, 352 or 354, Fig. 8A) in the

broker information screen. Please note that the "Microsoft Visual FoxPro" corresponds to

"broker information screen". It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at

the time of the invention to modify the teachings of Northington and O'Neil to include the broker

information links and screen associated with fields as taught by Raveis. The motivation of doing

so would have been to manage and globally distribute the brokers' information over the Internet.

10.   Regarding claim 12, Northington/O'Neil/Raveis combination discloses "broker public

key" for encryption purposes (see FIG. 4 and col. 9, lines 9-26, O'Neil).

11.   Regarding claims 13-18, Northington/O'Neil/Raveis combination discloses all of the

claimed subject matter as discussed above, except "report", "quote". It would have been obvious

to have this information in real estate services as evidenced by Raveis because these are the

elements of a complete "MORTGAGE" processing of Raveis' system (see "REAL ESTATE

SERVICES-MORTGAGE", Fig. 5, Raveis).

Response to Arguments

Applicant argues, Northington reference does not teach or suggest "a system or method

which relates to the administration of brokers, ...update information <u>at least</u> one of sales..."

Examiner respectively disagrees because Northington suggest all of the claimed limitation. For

example, Northington teaches a computerized financial system including the updating functions

that perform the updating of sale and purchase information (see col. 9, lines 49-58, Northington)

including "travel purchasing", "supply purchasing", "expenditures", "payments to contractors"

and "spending"...(see col. 1, lines 32-45 and col. 2, line 36, Northington). These are one of the

sale information. Further, Northington discloses "credit rating" (see column 15, line 49,

northington) and "financial transaction...debit..credit" (see col. 16, lines 7-16, Northignton).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to include a "rate change module" to update the rate

changes information associated with product time by time.

Applicant argues, "Northington and Harris lack the requisite motivation to combine".

Examiner respectively disagree because Northing disclose "entity's financial transaction

performed by various independent computerized systems" (summary of Northington) and Harris

discloses the "broker operations module" to find and identify the recipient of a transaction, sale

or purchasing. Harris is only used as a secondary teaching to establish that it was known to

provide "broker module" for the entity in Northington to have the broker to find and identify the

recipient of a transaction, sale or purchasing.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Hanh B Thai whose telephone number is 703-305-4883. The

examiner can normally be reached on 8 AM - 4:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Safet Metjahic can be reached on 703-308-1436. The fax phone numbers for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-746-9099 for regular

communications and 703-746-7240 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Hanh Thai
Art Unit 2171
August 14, 2003

SAFET METJAHIC
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100